

J. Edward Kerley (175695)
 Dylan L. Schaffer (153612)
Kerley Schaffer LLP
 1939 Harrison Street, #900
 Oakland, California 94612
 Telephone: (510) 379-5801

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

E VERRICK WISE an individual, **NOEL
 RUSSELL**, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**STATE FARM GENERAL INSURANCE
 COMPANY**, an Illinois corporation, and
DOES 1 through 10,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:23-cv-00163-HSG

**ORDER (AS MODIFIED) GRANTING
 PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION**

Dkt. No. 48

On January 9, 2024, Plaintiffs E Verrick Wise and Noel Russell ("Plaintiffs") filed an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party's Material Should Be Sealed, accompanied by the supporting declaration of Christopher Carlin. Dkt. No. 48. The administrative motion moves to seal Exhibit R and Exhibit X to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, Dkt. No. 47 – two internal State Farm training and resource documents that together total ten pages in length. On February 2, 2024, as directed by the Court, Defendant State Farm filed a statement articulating the various justifications for maintaining Exhibits R and X under seal. Dkt. No. 58. That same day, the parties stipulated to dismiss the case in its entirety. Dkt. No. 59. This result mooted Plaintiffs' Partial Summary Judgment motion before the Court ruled on it or had occasion to consider the exhibits at issue.


//

The Court, having read and considered Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion and the supporting declaration, Dkt. No. 48, and the statement filed by Defendant State Farm Gen. Ins. Co. and the supporting declaration, Dkt. No. 58, hereby rules on Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion, Dkt. No. 48, as follows:

Docket No. Public/(Sealed)	Document	Portion Sought to be Sealed	Basis to Seal Exhibits	Ruling
Dkt. No. 47-1/ (Dkt. No. 48-3)	Plaintiffs' Evidence in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment	Exhibit R (Dkt. No. 47-1 at 361)	Contain confidential materials that could injure Defendant's competitive advantage and cannot be protected through more narrowly tailored means. Dkt. No. 58.	Finding good cause, the Court GRANTS the request to seal these documents in this now-closed case. <i>Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu</i> , 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006)
Dkt. No. 47-1/ (Dkt. No. 48-3)	Plaintiffs' Evidence in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment	Exhibit X (Dkt. No. 47-1 at 522)		

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 6, 2024


 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
 United States District Judge